

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 5, 7 -13, 15-16, and 18 - 20 were presented for examination. The Office Action mailed February 10, 2011 rejects claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18-20. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 2, and 16. Claims 5 and 20 are cancelled. Claims 1- 4, 7 – 16, 18, and 19 remain pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication No. 2003/0162555 to Loveland in view of US Patent No. 7,092,977 to Leung et al. (hereinafter “Leung”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0172113 to Cameron et al. (hereinafter “Cameron”). To the extent the rejection remains applicable to pending claims 1 - 5, 7 -13, 15-16, and 18 - 20, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every claimed element and limitation of Applicants’ invention.

Applicants’ invention, as now set forth in representative claim 1, in pertinent part recites a method for synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a server database. The method comprises calculating at the server a document score for each document in a plurality of documents in the server database. Each document score designates an importance relative to other documents of a respective one of the documents to a respective one of the clients at one of the times, each document score indicative of whether the document should be synchronized between the respective client and the server database. The document score is calculated in part by determining whether a relationship exists between the respective one of the documents and another of the documents in the server database.

Accordingly, claim 1 is amended herein to include limitations similar to those of former claim 5. In particular, claim 1 is amended herein to clarify that “calculating a document score includes determining whether a relationship exists between the respective one of the documents and another of the documents in the server database.”

It is respectfully submitted that Loveland, Leung, and Cameron, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “calculating a document score includes determining whether a relationship exists between the respective one of the documents and another of the documents in the server database,” as recited in amended independent claim 1, for at least the following reasons.

Loveland at paragraph [0044] teaches emails being of varying importance. For example, an email that contains the words “coin” or “penny” may be of higher value to a penny collector than emails that do not contain these words. However, Loveland does not calculate a document score by determining whether a relationship exists between emails. In Loveland’s example, there is no relationship between the email containing the words “coin” or “penny” and other emails. Thus, a calculated score is not influenced (increased or decreased) based on the importance of other documents to the document being scored. For purposes of further clarifying this distinction, Applicants refer to paragraph [0020] of Applicants’ specification.

Leung and Cameron are relied in the Office Action to show other limitations of claim 1. However, Leung and Cameron also fail to teach or suggest calculating a document score by determining whether a relationship exists between the respective one of the documents and another of the documents in the server database,” as claimed in claim 1. Thus, no combination of Loveland, Leung, and Cameron teaches or suggests every element and limitation of independent claim 1 as now set forth. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Independent claim 16 recites language similar to that of claim 1, and therefore is allowable for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-11, 12-13, 15, and 18-20 depend directly or indirectly from one of the allowable independent claims, and incorporate all of the limitations of the respective independent claim. Thus these dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least those reasons provided in connection with the independent claims and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these dependent claims.

With respect to the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loveland, Leung, Cameron, and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2005/0065856 to Roberts (hereinafter “Roberts”), Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because claim 14 depends from independent claim 1, and is patentable for at least that reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2011
Reg. No. 58,037
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Timothy P. Collins/
Timothy P. Collins
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752